

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 332

TM 810 874

TITLE District-Wide Comprehensive Needs Assessment Study: Administrator Levels Report, Part II, 1980-81.

INSTITUTION Saginaw Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Evaluation Services.

PUB DATE Jun 81

NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Needs Assessment; Policy Formation; *School Districts; *School Surveys

IDENTIFIERS *Saginaw City School System MI

ABSTRACT

A needs assessment study was conducted to identify areas of consensus for respondent groups concerning attitudes toward educational issues. The overall findings of all respondents and each respondent group separately was presented. The groups were elementary, junior high, senior high, and central office administrators. Opinions of these groups are specifically examined. The similarities and differences observed between administrator respondent groups are highlighted. The similarities for administrator groups included opinions about the effects of absenteeism on achievement, back-to-basics movement, strict discipline, school expenditure reductions, and voluntary integration of schools. The differences were elementary and junior high administrators felt voluntary integration would improve the quality of education. However, senior high and central office administrators were split on this issue. It may near integration is seen as a social, rather than academic, goal. School administrators agreed students should be allowed to finish college work in high school, but central office administrators disagreed. The groups differed on the amount of confidence in the school board's ability to deal with school problems. Diverse responses were also received on questions of class size, effect of labor unions on public schools, and responsibility for student behavior problems. (DWH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

- ✕ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it. Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

148 018 W
7/10/87

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION SERVICES

- PROVIDING ASSESSMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH SERVICES -

Saginaw Public Schools
Saginaw, Michigan

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. N. Claus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

DISTRICT-WIDE COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS
ASSESSMENT STUDY

ADMINISTRATOR LEVELS REPORT
PART II

1980-81

An Approved Report of the
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL
Department of Evaluation, Testing and Research

Richard N. Claus
Richard N. Claus
Statistical Analyst

Barry E. Quimper
Barry E. Quimper, Director
Evaluation, Testing and Research

Dr. Foster B. Gibbs, Superintendent and
Dr. Jerry R. Baker, Assistant Superintendent
for Administration and Personnel
School District of the City of Saginaw

June, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Who was Included in Saginaw's School-Community Study?	1
How will the Findings of the Study be Reported?	2
How were the Data Collected?	3
PRESENTATION OF DATA	3
SUMMARY	12
Similarities	12
Differences	13
APPENDIX	15
Appendix A: Survey Groups and Return Rates for the 1981 Comprehensive School-Community Needs Assessment	16
Appendix A: Number of Administrators Returning the 1981 Comprehensive School-Community Needs Assessment by Instructional Level and/or Base Location	17

INTRODUCTION

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Saginaw Schools according to administrators, teachers, high school students, and parents? In what areas are schools performing as well as desired and where do inadequacies exist? What areas of operation warrant immediate attention to remedy weaknesses? What are perceptions about current educational issues? The answers to these questions are important to education, therefore, an effort was made during April and May, 1981, to gather information about them through a needs assessment survey.

The results of this survey are being reported in two different formats. The first type of report (Part 1) dealt specifically with determining an actual level of need based on the difference between what respondents feel "is," and "what should be." This report, the second in the series (Part 2); deals with the attitude of responding groups towards current educational issues. A Part 1 and Part 2 report will be provided at the district-wide, instructional and cluster levels.

Who Was Included in Saginaw's School-Community Study?

Information was gathered from administrators, teachers, parents, and senior high students. During April and May, 1981, the polled individuals completed questionnaires, to provide the necessary survey data. There were over 2,100 respondents to the instruments (see Appendix A for the exact count of usable returns by respondent group). This report presents responses from elementary, junior high, senior high, and central office administrators

separately. The combined results of these groups with the addition of special education and adult and continuing education administrators in the administrator system total are also presented. Since the number of special and adult and continuing education administrators were so small, they were not included except in the system total.

How will the Findings of the Study be Reported?

A series of reports will result from this study:

- I. District-Wide Comprehensive Needs Assessment Study: presenting the system total and totals by groups of elementary, secondary, special education, and adult and continuing education teacher, administrators; parents; and students. Intended audiences include: Board of Education, superintendent, administrators, teachers, and community.
- II. Instructional Level Reports: presenting summary information for elementary, junior high, senior high, special education, adult and continuing education, and administrator (this report) levels. Intended audiences include: Board of Education, superintendent, assistant superintendents, and central office administrative staff.
- III. Cluster Level Reports: presenting summary information for each elementary, junior high, and senior high school cluster. Intended audiences include: assistant superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, and students.

The intent of providing the results in this type of format is to provide for decision-makers the kinds of information that will be useful in reaching decisions within their realm of responsibility. A companion "Part I" type of report for each level will also be made available.

How were the Data Collected?

The data for students and parents were gathered from samples drawn from the various populations while all teachers and administrators were polled. Parents were surveyed by means of a mailed questionnaire, while questionnaires for all other respondents were hand-delivered. Many of the questions were adapted from the Gallup Poll of the public's attitude toward the schools. The "Part 2" portion of this questionnaire contained a total of 24 multiple choice questions concerning attitudes toward current educational issues. Parents and administrators were asked to respond to all 24 questions, teachers to 17 questions, and students to 15 questions.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

One of the major purposes of this needs assessment study was to identify areas in which consensus existed for the respondent groups concerning their attitudes toward educational issues. These educational issues may be of importance in setting policy, making decisions, or developing new programs in the future. The responses presented should help decision makers better understand each group.

The overall findings of all respondents and each respondent group separately will be presented in the section which follows. The percent choosing each multiple choice option is presented for all groups and the total. The number of respondents by group (to each question) is also provided.

A number of similarities and differences between groups are highlighted in a short summary section. The reader is encouraged to study the results in detail because any summary must by its very nature ignore some of the finer points.

SYSTEM-WIDE RESPONSES TO THE PART II PORTION OF THE
SCHOOL-COMMUNITY SURVEY--SPRING, 1981.

Question	RESPONDENT GROUPS								System Total	
	Administrators						Central Office Administrator			
	Elementary		Jr. High		Sr. High				%	#
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Should high school courses be arranged so that students can finish one year of college work while they are still in high school and can graduate from college in three years instead of four?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	33	8	36	4	27	3	52	15	41	34
2. No	54	13	55	6	73	8	38	11	50	41
3. Don't know	13	3	9	1	0	0	10	3	9	7
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		29		82
How important are extracurricular activities to a young person's education—extremely important, fairly important, not too important?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Extremely important	38	9	45	5	55	6	24	7	39	32
2. Fairly important	50	12	55	6	45	5	66	19	54	44
3. Not too important	13	3	0	0	0	0	10	3	7	6
4. Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		29		82
Should job placement service be operated by our schools?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	79	19	100	11	91	10	55	16	74	61
2. No	13	3	0	0	9	1	34	10	20	16
3. Don't know	8	2	0	0	0	0	10	3	6	5
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		29		82

Question	RESPONDENT GROUPS								System Total	
	Administrators						Central Office Administrator			
	Elementary		Jr. High		Sr. High				%	#
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Would you favor changing from the present elementary (K-6), junior high (7-9), and high school (10-12) grade arrangement to a middle school concept where grades 6-8 would be taught in the same building?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	54	13	91	10	82	9	66	19	66	54
2. No	38	9	9	1	18	2	17	5	24	20
3. Don't know	8	2	0	0	0	0	17	5	10	8
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		29		82
In your opinion, do you believe that student absenteeism is in part responsible for lower student achievement?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	100	24	100	11	100	11	90	26	95	78
2. No	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	5	4
3. Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		29		82
What would you do with a vacant school which has been closed due to a drop in enrollment? Would you use it for:										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Community activities	10	2	10	1	22	2	7	2	11	7
2. Vocational and job training	0	0	0	0	22	2	7	2	7	5
3. Cultural centers	5	1	10	1	0	0	11	3	8	5
4. Senior citizen center	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
5. Sell, rent, or lease	67	12	80	8	44	3	70	18	66	45
6. Don't know	14	2	0	0	11	1	4	1	7	5
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		18		10		8		26		68

Question	RESPONDENT GROUPS								System Total	
	Administrators						Central Office Administrator			
	Elementary		Jr. High		Sr. High		%	#	%	#
	%	#	%	#	%	#				
Do you think large classes make a great deal of difference, little difference, or no difference at all in a student's achievement?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Great deal of difference	70	14	64	7	45	5	29	8	50	39
2. Little difference	25	5	36	4	45	5	72	21	47	37
3. No difference at all	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. Don't know	5	1	0	0	9	1	0	0	3	2
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		20		11		11		29		78
Do you think the <u>Saginaw News</u> gives a fair and accurate picture of the public schools in this community?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	8	2	9	1	18	2	21	6	15	12
2. No	88	21	91	10	73	8	71	20	80	64
3. Don't know	4	1	0	0	9	1	7	2	5	4
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		28		80
If high school students can meet academic requirements in three years instead of four, should they be permitted to graduate early?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	63	15	64	7	55	6	69	20	66	54
2. No	38	9	27	3	45	5	31	9	32	26
3. Don't know	0	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		29		82

Question	RESPONDENT GROUPS								System Total	
	Administrators						Central Office Administrator			
	Elementary		Jr. High		Sr. High		%	#	%	#
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
How much confidence do you have in the school board's ability to deal with school problems—a great deal of confidence, a fair amount, very little, or none?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. A great deal of difference	57	13	27	3	36	4	29	8	38	30
2. A fair amount	43	10	64	7	64	7	54	15	55	44
3. Very little	0	0	9	1	0	0	18	5	8	6
4. None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		23		11		11		28		80
Would you favor or oppose a system that would hold teachers and administrators more accountable for the progress of students?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Favor	75	18	36	4	91	10	79	23	73	60
2. Oppose	17	4	36	4	0	0	10	3	16	13
3. Don't know	8	2	27	3	9	1	10	3	11	9
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		29		82
A suggestion has been made that parents of school children attend one evening meeting a month at school to find out what they can do at home to improve their children's behavior and school work. Do you agree?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Agree	83	20	82	9	55	6	86	25	79	65
2. Disagree	13	3	9	1	36	4	10	3	13	11
3. Don't know	4	1	9	1	9	1	3	1	7	6
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		29		82

Question	RESPONDENT GROUPS								System Total	
	Administrators						Central Office Administrator			
	Elementary		Jr. High		Sr. High		%	#	%	#
	%	#	%	#	%	#				
Do you favor a back-to-basics movement (an emphasis on reading, writing and arithmetic)?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Favor	96	22	82	9	100	11	79	23	83	67
2. Oppose	4	1	18	2	0	0	17	5	14	11
3. Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	3
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		23		11		11		29		81
Would you send your children to a special public school that has strict discipline and puts emphasis on the three R's?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	88	21	73	8	64	7	63	17	70	56
2. No	8	2	9	1	36	4	26	7	19	15
3. Don't know	4	1	18	2	0	0	11	3	11	9
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		27		80
Have teacher unions helped, hurt or made no difference in the quality of public school education in the United States?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Helped	5	1	45	5	18	2	4	1	13	10
2. Hurt	57	12	45	5	64	7	75	21	65	51
3. Made no difference	19	4	0	0	9	1	14	4	12	9
4. Don't know	19	4	9	1	9	1	7	2	10	8
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		21		11		11		28		78
Should students who are frequently absent without good reason be dismissed from school?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	13	3	64	7	73	8	41	11	39	31
2. No	78	18	36	4	27	3	52	14	54	43
3. Don't know	9	2	0	0	0	0	7	2	6	5
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		23		11		11		27		79

Question	RESPONDENT GROUPS								System Total	
	Administrators						Central Office Administrator			
	Elementary		Jr. High		Sr. High				%	#
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Suppose the local public schools said they needed much more money to cover cost of inflation. As you feel at this time, would you vote to raise taxes for this purpose?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	88	21	100	11	91	17	86	24	90	73
2. No	4	1	0	0	0	0	14	4	0	5
3. Don't know	8	2	0	0	9	1	0	0	4	3
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		28		81
Would you favor an increase in state taxes so that real estate taxes could be lowered on local property for school expenditures?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	83	20	64	7	36	4	64	18	65	53
2. No	8	2	18	2	36	4	29	8	23	19
3. Don't know	8	2	18	2	27	2	7	2	11	9
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		28		81
Which of the following items would you cut first to reduce school expenditures?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Reduce teachers by increasing class size	0	0	10	1	0	0	4	1	3	2
2. Close buildings and increase class size	68	11	80	8	67	5	69	16	66	42
3. Cut out kindergarten	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	1
4. Reduce janitorial services	11	2	0	0	22	2	8	2	8	5
5. Reduce classroom supplies	11	2	10	1	0	0	8	2	10	6
6. Don't know	11	2	0	0	11	1	8	2	11	7
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		17		10		8		24		63

Question	RESPONDENT GROUPS								System Total	
	Administrators						Central Office			
	Elementary		Jr. High		Sr. High		Administrator		%	#
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#		
Student behavior problems such as striking a teacher may occur from time to time in our schools, in your opinion, who should deal with this kind of problem--should it be the parents, the school, or the courts?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. The parents	8	1	14	1	29	2	12	3	13	8
2. The schools	62	8	43	3	29	2	50	13	50	30
3. The courts	31	4	43	3	43	3	31	8	32	19
4. Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	5	3
<u>Number of Respondents</u>	13		7		7		26		60	
Should parents be required to meet regularly with school personnel before each year to examine the grades, test scores, and career goals for each of their children?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	82	18	55	6	82	9	75	21	75	59
2. No	14	3	18	2	9	1	14	4	15	12
3. Don't know	5	1	27	3	9	1	11	3	10	8
<u>Number of Respondents</u>	22		11		11		28		79	
Would you favor voluntary integration in the district?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Favor	87	20	100	11	80	3	82	23	86	68
2. Oppose	13	3	0	0	0	0	11	3	9	7
3. Don't know	0	0	0	0	20	2	7	2	5	4
<u>Number of Respondents</u>	23		11		10		28		79	

Question	RESPONDENT GROUPS								System Total	
	Administrators						Central Office Administrator			
	Elementary		Jr. High		Sr. High				%	#
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Do you feel voluntary integration would improve the quality of education for students?										
<u>Ratings/Choices</u>										
1. Yes	33	8	36	4	27	3	43	12	37	30
2. No	42	10	64	7	27	3	43	12	43	35
3. Don't know	25	6	0	0	45	5	14	4	20	16
<u>Number of Respondents</u>		24		11		11		28		81

SUMMARY

A number of similarities and differences observed between administrator respondent groups are highlighted below in list form. The decision rule for determining a similarity is agreement either in a positive or negative direction. Agreement is reached when 51% or more of all groups (disregarding the "don't know" responses) had responses in one direction. A difference occurs when one or more groups are no longer in agreement. Comments are offered when appropriate to amplify the meaning of the response patterns noted.

Similarities

- All administrator groups believed that student absenteeism, in part, is responsible for lowered student achievement (range 90% to 100%).
- All administrator groups favored a back-to-basics movement (range 79% to 100%).
- All groups were inclined toward sending their children to a special public school that has strict discipline and puts emphasis on the three R's (range 63% to 88%).
- All groups felt the Saginaw News does not give a fair and accurate picture of the Saginaw Public Schools (range 71% to 91%).
- All groups felt that job placement services should be operated by the schools (range 55% to 100%).
- All groups believed senior high students should be permitted to graduate in three years instead of four if they can meet the academic requirements (range 55% to 69%).
- All administrator groups agreed that the middle school concept, where grades 6-8 would be taught in the same building, should be installed in our schools (range 54% to 91%).

- All groups felt vacant schools should be disposed of when they were closed due to a drop in enrollment (range 44% to 80%).
- All administrator groups favored an increase in state taxes to cover the cost of inflation in school expenditures (range 86% to 100%).
- All administrator groups agreed that they would close buildings as their first priority to reduce school expenditures (range 69% to 80%).
- All groups favored both the requirement that parents meet prior to the start of school with school personnel for the review of their children's progress and the suggestion that parents attend one evening meeting monthly to learn about ways to improve their children's behavior and school work (range 55% to 82% and 55% to 86%).
- The majority of all administrator respondents either felt that extra-curricular activities are extremely important or fairly important to a young person's education (scale--extremely important, fairly important, not too important).
- All groups favored voluntary integration of the school district (range 80% to 100%).

Differences

- Elementary and junior high administrators felt voluntary integration would improve the quality of education, while senior high and central office administrators were evenly split on whether or not voluntary integration would improve educational achievement. This may mean that people see integration as a social goal rather than one to primarily improve academic achievement.
- Elementary, junior and senior high administrators agreed that high school students should be allowed to finish college work while still in high school (54%, 55%, and 73% respectively), while central office administrators disagreed (52%).
- Elementary administrators gave a "great deal" confidence rating (scale--great deal, fair amount, very little, none) to the school board's ability to deal with school problems, while the remaining administrative groups gave the school board a "fair" rating (range 54% to 64%).

- Senior high administrators were equally split on whether large class sizes negatively affect student achievement, while central office administrators felt large classes do little to affect achievement (72%); and elementary and junior high administrators felt large classes do negatively affect achievement (70% and 64% respectively).
- Elementary, senior high and central office administrators found holding teachers and administrators more accountable for student progress (range 75% to 91%), while junior high administrators were equally divided on this issue (36% favor and 36% oppose).
- Elementary, senior high and central office administrators agreed that labor unions have hurt public schools (range 57% to 75%), while junior high administrators were equally split in their responses (45% help and 45% hurt).
- It seems that the policy to dismiss frequently absent students applies to secondary level students for most respondents. Junior and senior high administrators felt that frequently absent students should be dismissed from school (64% and 73% respectively); while elementary and central office administrators felt these students should not be dismissed (78% and 52% respectively).
- Senior high administrators were equally split on their agreement with a state tax increase so that real estate taxes related to school expenditures could be lowered (36% yes and 36% no), while all other groups favored such an increase (range 64% to 83%).
- The question of whether the parents, the schools, or the courts should handle student behavior problems such as striking a teacher obtained a range of diverse responses. Elementary and central office administrators felt it was the schools' job (62% and 50% respectively). Junior high administrators were equally split between the schools and the courts (43% and 43% respectively). Senior high administrators were in favor of the courts dealing with such problems (43%).

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

SURVEY GROUPS AND RETURN RATES FOR THE 1981 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Groups Surveyed	Count and Description of Individuals in Sample or Population	Returns	
		#	%
Parents	A sample of <u>4,392</u> parents who were registered and voted in November, 1979 and/or October, 1980 millage elections. (Follow-up mailed to low return rate areas.)	867	20
Elementary Teachers	All <u>476</u> teachers paid February 26, 1981.	326	68
Secondary Teachers	All <u>406</u> teachers paid February 26, 1981.	203	50
Special Education Teachers	All <u>111</u> teachers at Millet Center, Handley Elementary (support staff), and Holland Education paid February 26, 1981.	75	68
Adult & Continuing Education Teachers	All <u>71</u> teachers paid February 26, 1981.	29	41
Administrators	All <u>122</u> administrators or technicians paid February 26, 1981.	84	69
Students	A sample of approximately <u>495</u> students from grades 10, 11, and 12 of both high schools.	603	122

APPENDIX A

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS RETURNING THE 1981 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL- COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL AND/OR BASE LOCATION

Instructional Level and/or Base Location	Returns Number
Elementary Administrators	24
Junior High Administrators	12
Senior High Administrators	15
Central Office Administrators	29
Adult & Continuing/Special Education Administrators	7
TOTAL	87